

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/070,125	KOSUGI, YASUHIKO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	LAM S NGUYEN	2853	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) LAM S NGUYEN. (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) JAY BECKSTEAD. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: WALKER (US 6302527).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*See the attachment.*

*Lam Nguyen*

*Hai Pham*

HAI PHAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 2853

The applicants argued that Walker discloses two different ink containers, one is loaded on the carriage, the other is off carriage, able to communicate with the communication unit. This is different from the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 11 recite to only one ink container that is able to communicate with the communication unit either located on or off carriage. The examiner will consider and recheck the prior art.